As the War in Vietnam Widens, Freedom Shrinks, Pps. 2-3

The South Produces A Great New Humorist In Its Hour of Crisis

"Many peaceful demonstrations by Negro citizens of this state have been carried out throughout Alabama. . . . We have even had policemen there to see that no one got hurt."
—Alabama's Gov. Wallace on CBS Face The Nation Mar. 14

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 11 MARCH 22, 1965 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Ultimate Stakes in the Voting Rights Struggle

Their power of identification, and their limited sympathies, are wondrous characteristics of men. When Wallace's Alabama State Troopers killed Jimmie Lee Jackson, the murder registered on the national consciousness only as another in the long and familiar role of Negro slayings in the South. But when racist toughs in Selma a week later took the life of a white clergyman, the Rev. James J. Reeb of Boston, they aroused a large section of the nation. This was a white man and it was a clergyman. All over the country (except—significantly enough—in the South), clergymen identified with the victim. This was an attack on *them*. A highly articulate and respected sector of white leadership was mobilized, and led a sizeable portion of the population with it into the streets of almost every large Northern city. The result was that joint night session of Congress last week in which the President sounded like Martin Luther King and was warmly applauded when he picked up the theme song of the civil rights movement, and declared "We shall overcome." That session, and the new voting bill it promises, are a memorial to that idealistic young minister. Rarely has one man's death so moved a whole nation to action. Of him, it may truly be said, he died to set men free.

A Tribute to Negro Demonstrations

This swiftly summoned night session of Congress was unique in that it received not just one but two messages from the President on the same subject. The original message, which the President sent up but did not deliver, was a sedate and learned discourse on voting rights which read as if it had been drafted in the Justice Department. The other—the one the President read to the joint session—sounded more like a sermon than a state paper. It was the country preacher in the President speaking; it was full of evangelical passion. He seems to have begun work on it at the last moment in dissatisfaction with the formal message, and he himself made considerable changes even as he spoke. Even for the skeptical and the wary, it was a speech that made one want to stand in the darkness outside the White House and cheer the President when he drove back. For one thing, it was almost entirely free of the ambivalence which marks most political utterance. Only at one point were we given vulgarized Holmes about the right of free speech not including the right to "holler fire" and an echo of Southern cant about the rights of demonstration not including "the right to endanger the safety of others on a public highway." It would be more germane to say that the right of highway patrol does not give the Alabama state police the right to suppress the First Amendment. But this sop to the South was more than outweighed when the President paid tribute to the Negro demonstrator. For the first time, instead of the usual respectable clichés about taking the fight out of the streets and into the courts, we had the President saying, "The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro. . . . His demonstrations have been designed to call attention to injustice . . . who among us can say we would have made the same progress were it not for his persistent bravery." The President spoke from experience. Until the disorders in Selma, he himself was wavering on the timing and content of a new voting rights bill.

**Setting An Example—
For Mendacity and Murder**

"I am against police brutality. I have always been so, and there has been only one instance in all of the weeks and months of provocation in this state that the police force of Alabama have been charged or intimated or stated by the Justice Department to have been engaged in police brutality."
—Gov. Wallace on CBS Face The Nation Mar. 14.

"Angered toughs in Selma, Ala., have been charged with the night-time murder of a young white minister. . . . A nation, indignant and shocked . . . asks, 'Why?' The answer is a mosaic. Certainly the men who attacked the young minister had seen, or heard, of the brutalities of state 'peace officers' acting on orders of the Governor. . . . If the Governor, the sheriff and other officials set violence examples, the hate groups and the lawless feel they have a certain license."
—Ralph McGill of the* Atlanta Constitution *in the* New York Herald-Tribune, *same day.

Uneducated Negroes and foreign observers will be comforted to know that they are no more confused than many of us here in Washington about this need for a new voting rights bill. Three times in the last seven years we have been assured that the Negro's fundamental right to vote had at last been guaranteed by new and hard-won legislation. In 1957, in 1960 and again in 1964, we were supposed to have given the Negro's right to vote firm Federal protection. Now it turns out that a new bill is needed. The best explanation was made by Congressman Resnick of New York Feb. 8 when he introduced the most comprehensive and thoroughgoing of all the voting rights bill this session. He said the first obstacle was that the Federal district courts in the South (manned as they largely are by Eastland's hand-picked little band of

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

News Censorship and Nuclear Bombing Now Planned for Vietnam . . .

Day by day Johnson's policy in Vietnam becomes more indistinguishable from Goldwater's. If it ends in a major war, as seems likely, the 1964 elections will look like one of the greatest frauds in American history. The U.S. Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, ended his one-week visit to the battlefront "enormously encouraged" and told newsmen in Saigon "Freedom is on the line here" (*Washington Star,* Mar. 12). But the same dispatch said that one of the subjects discussed on his visit was "the possibility of imposing military censorship or some variant of this on news correspondents serving in Vietnam." For four years the public's only check on the consistently misleading statements of our high brass (like the French before them) has come in the dispatches of hard-working newsmen on the scene. Now this may be shut off.

The Penalty for Advocating Peace

Gen. Johnson's statement and the press briefing which accompanied it were in accordance with the policy of leaking unpleasant news out in advance "without attribution" to test public reaction. But few papers published this dispatch in full and even fewer stopped to comment on its implications. "Various sources close to the Johnson mission," the AP said, "have reported that items under study included commitment of U.S. combat units, increased bombing of North Vietnam *and even the selection of possible targets for nuclear bombing.*" (Our italics.) With such plans in the making, this is a bad time to let down the iron curtain of military censorship around Vietnam. As in most wars to make some place or other safe for democracy, an early move is to get rid of democracy's inconveniences: here the right to known, there the right to speak. Though we are supposed to be defending South Vietnam's right to self-determination, any South Vietnamese who tries to determine his country's policy for himself is in danger unless he agrees with the military. A harbinger of what is coming appeared in a UPI dispatch from Saigon (*Washington Daily News,* March 15) which said Vietnamese Army officers in Danang "planned to deport three leaders of a Communist-backed 'peace' movement."

New Congo Revolt Hushed Up

"Leopoldville, the Congo (AP)—The Congolese Army has clamped a news blackout on the northeastern war zone after one of its battalions there announced it would refuse to continue to fight Congo rebels.

"Military sources had reported yesterday that the 13th Commando Battalion stationed at Bunia was refusing to accompany 250 of Prime Minister Moise Tshombe's English-speaking white mercenaries on a northward move to seal the Congo's frontiers with Uganda and the Sudan."

—Washington Evening Star, *Mar. 10.*

(In dispatches from Saigon peace is always put in quotation marks and anyone who wants it is labelled pro-Communist.) The UPI said "three Vietnamese professional men will be taken over North Vietnamese territory in a plane fitted with parachutes and pushed out," an order since cancelled but a foretaste of the future.

In advance of formal censorship, the military are already beginning to impose a news blackout. Beverly Deepe provided a vivid picture of this in her dispatch to the *New York Herald-Tribune* March 15 on the bombing of Tiger Island. An Embassy spokesman said certain details on air raids such as the approximate number of planes and the bases from which they came would no longer be given out. "He said the new policy," Miss Deepe cabled, "was made necessary for military security reasons" which he added, "I myself do not understand." The spokesman said the new policy originated "in a six-page compilation of security messages received from the Pentagon." Miss Deepe quoted an unnamed U.S. official as commenting, "We have not encountered any explanation of this that makes any sense." The *New York Herald-Tribune,* after getting Miss Deepe's dispatch, phoned the Pentagon for an explanation and inserted this lovely example of typical military run-around. "In Washington," the *Herald-Tribune* reported, "officials said they had no knowledge of the security directive" but "they defended the right of U.S. officials to withhold such information, however, arguing that even disclosing the reason for withholding it might provide the enemy

Church's Version of That Apocryphal Story About LBJ, Lippmann and Dams for Idaho

"There is one comment I feel obliged to make concerning a story which has been given general currency. The story comes in two versions, both of which are too pungent to be resisted. . . . I would leave the story unanswered, except that both versions tend to discredit the President. The first version was published in the New York Herald-Tribune on Sunday, February 28, 1965, and reads:

'"Who'd you talk to before giving that speech [on Vietnam]?" the President wanted to know. "Why, Mr. President, I had a long talk with Walter Lippmann," Church replied. "Well, Frank," the President shot back, "next time you need a dam in Idaho, why don't you talk to Lippmann."'

"The second version appeared in the March 12th edition of Time magazine. It reads: 'At one of the White House receptions, Johnson spotted Church, went over to him and said: "Frank, you've been making some speeches that haven't been very helpful." Said Church: "Well, Mr. President, if you read the speech all the way through, it isn't the same as the headline." "The headlines are all I read and all anybody reads. When you were in trouble out in your state, Frank I used to come out and give you a hand, didn't I?" Answered Church defensively: "Mr. President, what I've been saying isn't much different from what Walter Lippmann has been writing." The President had the last words. "Walter Lippmann," he said, "is a fine man. I admire him. Next time you're in trouble out in Idaho, Frank, you ask Walter to come help." Church has since noticeably modified his criticisms of U.S. policy in Vietnam.'

"The actual facts concerning the matter were given by Edward P. Morgan, in his radio broadcast on March 5th. He said: 'The President and the Senator did have a firm and friendly encounter on the subject but a careful check of White House and Senate sources reveals that no such angry exchange took place, but, disturbingly enough, it develops that one high administration official had pointedly encouraged the belief that it did.'

"Let me add that, as to my present position on Vietnam, it has not changed in any way. The debate in the Senate on this crucial question isn't over. It has just begun."

—*Sen. Frank Church* (D., Idaho), *in the Senate, Mar. 9.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Day by Day Johnson's Policy Becomes Indistinguishable from Goldwater's

with information." The chances are that the enemy knows more about these raids than we do, and that the enemy the military is really worried about informing is the dratted civilian back home.

Loss of Faith in The Democratic Party

The U.S. public may be drugged by an acquiescent press and a rubber stamp Congress but under the surface there is a growing uneasiness. The latest Gallup poll (*New York Herald-Tribune,* March 14) shows that while 45% in October thought the Democrats more likely than the Republicans to keep us out of war, the percentage had fallen to 32%. The only consolation for Democrats is that the number who had faith in the Republicans has also fallen in that period, from 22% to 20%. We wish more newspapers would try out on their readers the questions which the *San Francisco Chronicle* put in its area. These questions, unlike Gallup's, really test opinion by offering a wide range instead of simple alternatives. The results in the March 9 *Chronicle* show 70% thought our original intervention in 1954 unwise even though 53% also thought the result by now would have been a Communist takeover. A second question, on what to do now, showed only 14% for the "whatever it takes to win" policy President Johnson is pursuing. There were 24% for holding the line against widening of the war, 53% for handing the problem over to the UN and 54% for pulling out altogether. To the question, "Do you feel it essential to our security that U.S. armed forces remain in South Vietnam?" 80% answered "No." The vote was 82% for and 15% against negotiating with Communist China along the lines urged by de Gaulle and U Thant. The *Chronicle* said this last percentage was exactly like that of a recent Gallup poll on the same question.

Every once in a while a few dispatches come through which really open a glimpse into the hell that this war is for the South Vietnamese. Two AP stories of this kind we saw only in the York, Penna., *Gazette & Daily* (March 11). One from Saigon said there are estimated to be more than 20,000 homeless children in South Vietnam. Many of them live by roving "in small bands specializing in petty thievery." The other was an interview with two Lancaster County, Pa., servicemen just back from duty in Vietnam. They told the AP civilian conditions were "just terrible" but "the children are the ones that really get you. You find them begging everywhere. They eat anything they can get hold of." One of the soldiers said of the South Vietnamese, "They don't care. They're tired of the war and the way they live is just terrible." Were the question put to a vote there *and* here, we feel sure the verdict would be for withdrawal of our troops and a negotiated peace. That's why there will be less democracy allowed in both places as the war proceeds and widens.

Feeble Support for A Feeble Arms Agency

The Senate last week reluctantly approved a two year, $20 million authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency but rejected the four year, $55 million request of the President. The debate was appalling. It is true that the agency has been timid and unproductive and that its funds have become a boondoggle for cold warrior research operations in Washington—"so-called nonprofit institutions organized by former Government and military employees of high rank," as Senator Ellender called them. Yet the agency's creation four years ago during the Berlin crisis at least represented an uneasiness in Congress over our gigantic military budget and the danger of world holocaust. Today these concerns are even less evident. Despite the strenuous efforts of Senators Clark, Morse, Proxmire and Javits and the increasing possibility of a full-scale war in Asia, only 38 Senators supported the President in his minute step toward making the agency more independent. "Perhaps the best part of the Arms Control Agency," said Proxmire, "is that it is so intimately and directly tied to our defense operations. It is not an agency of idealists who want to disarm the country." Arguments like this, and there were many, made it difficult to distinguish the liberal position from that of Senator Fulbright, who opposed the President's request. "No matter how desirable the goal of complete and general disarmament," he said, "I consider it to be such a remote possibility as to be almost a form of escapism." Once again the Senator has spelled out the realities he does so little to change.

Long's Truce Agreement With Postoffice An Anti-Climax to His Snooping Investigation

It is a pity that Senator Edward Long (D., Mo.) is not as vigorous about curtailing government snooping as he is in exposing it. This is the conclusion we draw from his truce agreement last week with Postmaster General Gronouski. Long repeatedly had asked the Post Office to turn over to his Senate investigating committee the 24,000 names of persons who have been subjected to mail cover surveillance in the last two years. A mail cover, which can be granted at the request of any law enforcement officer, consists of recording names and addresses on a person's incoming mail. The Post Office defends it as a device for tracking down fugitives and mail frauds, but it has been used for less commendable purposes such as spying on welfare recipients and learning the identity of witnesses for the defense in Federal prosecutions. Long wanted to examine the list of names as a prelude to corrective legislation, but last week he agreed to drop his request on condition that the Post Office tighten its own regulations.

This sets a poor precedent for dealing with other uncooperative agencies. It is naive to think that law enforcement officers, without any statutory guidelines, will give the same concern to protecting constitutional rights that they do to pursuing criminals. The testimony of the Chief Postal Inspector, H. B. Montague, is revealing. "I don't think there is any constitutional right here," he said in discussing mail covers before Long's committee. "We are [only] talking about privacy." When asked why the Post Office never checked into requests for mail covers, he replied that "there has to be some trust and mutual understanding among law enforcement agencies or you would never get your work done. We have confidence in these agencies." This should discourage any optimism about self-regulation.

What is needed is strict legal prohibitions, and soon. Space and missile research is now flooding the market with sophisticated and inexpensive electronic spying devices. The demand for these devices from federal agencies is becoming so great that one manufacturer confessed to Senator Long that he cannot produce them fast enough, and has discontinued sales promotion. Long will have support if he meets the problem head-on. No one likes to be spied upon.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Long Will Johnson Be Blind Abroad to What He Sees At Home?

(*Continued from Page One*)

white supremacists), have been dragging their heels. He said that Selma's Dallas County "dramatically exemplifies the *ineffectiveness of existing legislation.*" Soon after the passage of the 1960 act, the Justice Department filed suit against the Dallas County Board of Registrars. "Four years and five more Federal suits later," Congressman Resnick said, "effective relief is yet to be forthcoming, and the first voting referee is yet to be appointed. . . . Last week a Federal district court issued its most recent order. That order tolerates a situation in which the board of registration is open only 2 days each month." Resnick's proposal is for a Federal Voting Registration and Elections Commission with full power to end all abuses against Negro voting in the South, and with direct access for enforcement to the Courts of Appeals. It provides the best standard against which to judge the bi-partisan bill promised by the President. Only such a fresh agency can put a stop to the endless ingenuity the South's lawyers and judges have shown in evading the intent of Congress.

The Nazi-Style Mystique About Wallace

This is more than a legislative problem. The full enfranchisement of the Negro in the South is a revolutionary change, a century delayed when Reconstruction ended. Only a system of Federal registrars can get the job done, and those registrars will have to be protected by Federal marshals if not troops. The killings in the South only reflect the murderous hate in the eyes of the white onlookers as Negroes and white sympathizers parade and demonstrate. The fact that not a single local clergyman joined the demonstrators in Selma and not a single local Church opened its doors to them last Sunday indicate the fury in the area at the prospect of losing white supremacy. A new crop of politicians, a new and polite kind of Sheriff, are the minimum to be expected from Negro voting. The maximum is the revival of that Southern progressivism killed off when the Populist movement was wrecked by race prejudice. The opposing forces will not take these changes lightly. Alabama's state police and Sheriff Clark's posses are the storm troopers of an American Fascism. Wallace is their Fuehrer. "We will follow him because we believe," so read the official inaugural program when Wallace became Governor on Jan. 13, 1963. "We believe stronger than the Communists or the pseudo-liberals, or the mongrelizers, or the commanders of crushing military might. We believe God has given us a man—and we believe." This mystique reads as if translated from German, and it indicates the ultimate stakes. The fight to free the Negro is also a fight to free the South and the country from an un-American, racist and authoritarian ideology. The Negro is not the only one intimidated in Alabama, just as the Jew was not the only one intimidated in Germany.

We found it unpleasant when the President last night tried to equate the civil rights struggle here with his war in Vietnam. Wallace in his *Face The Nation* appearance last Sunday took the same attitude toward the former that President Johnson does toward the latter. For Wallace the civil rights struggle is simply a Communist plot, and the Southern Negro would acquiesce in inferiority if only the North would withdraw its agitators and let its Southern neighbors alone. Wallace, like the State Department in its recent White Paper on Vietnam, could supply the names of Northern agitators caught infiltrating the South and no doubt prove that some of them are Communists of one kind or another. If the South had an air fleet, it could threaten to bomb the North unless it called off this covert aggression. Can the President not see that "wars of liberation" in Vietnam or elsewhere are not artificial products of alien "subversion" but the reflection of real grievances which must be corrected if there is to be peace? How long will he remain blind abroad to what he sees so clearly at home? *March 16*

Who'd Have Guessed It In Alabama?

"When asked why a large force of Federal marshals had not been dispatched to Selma, the Attorney General said that this would have been possible only if the Government had had three or four days notice. . . . 'We had no reason to believe that local law enforcement officials would set upon non-violent and peaceful citizens in the way in which they did,' he said."

—New York Times, *Mar. 12.*

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/22/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED